

REMARKS

Examiner has rejected Claim 1 based on Lamka et al, and has further stated that Claim 1 of the instant application is in conflict with Claim 1 of Application No. 10/288,146 (now issued).

In response thereto, Applicant has now cancelled Claim 1 of the instant application, and has submitted new Claims 2-30 in replacement thereof. Applicant respectfully believes that the cited reference does not teach or otherwise disclose the invention as claimed in Applicant's new Claims 2-30. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the present case.

CONCLUSION

The above-made amendments are to form only and thus, no new matter was added. Applicant respectfully believes the above-made amendments now place the application in condition for allowance. This Response to Office Action is believed to be a full and complete response thereto. Should there be any questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Dated: 7/20/2005

Myers & Kaplan,
Intellectual Property Law, L.L.C.
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA 30339
Phone: 770-541-7444
Fax: 770-541-7448
E-mail: apatel@mkiplaw.com

Respectfully submitted,



Ashish D. Patel, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 50,177